## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

LAS VEGAS DEVELOPMENT GROUP, LLC,  Plaintiff(s),	) Case No. 2:15-cv-00917-GMN-NJK ) ORDER
v. 2014-3 IH EQUITY OWNER, LP, et al., Defendant(s).	(Docket No. 45)

Pending before the Court is Defendant Bank of America's motion to stay discovery pending resolution of its motion to dismiss. Docket No. 45; *see also* Docket Nos. 47, 52 (joinders).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed a response, which does not contest the relief sought. *See* Docket No. 54 ("Plaintiff does not oppose the entry of a stay"). Moreover, the Court agrees that a stay of discovery is appropriate in this case pending resolution of Defendant's motion to dismiss. *See, e.g., Kor Media Group, LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013) (outlining standards). Accordingly, Defendant's motion to stay discovery is hereby **GRANTED**. In the event resolution of the motion to dismiss does not result in the termination of this case, the parties shall file a joint proposed discovery plan within 14 days of the issuance of the order resolving that motion. The parties' recently filed discovery plan (Docket No. 61) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The motion is mislabeled as a motion to partially lift the stay in this matter. The stay was already lifted. *See* Docket No. 44. The motion actually seeks a stay of discovery pending resolution of the motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 3-4.

In its response, Plaintiff seeks to stay the entire case (including of the resolution of the motion to dismiss). *See* Docket No. 54 at 7-9. A responsive brief is not a vehicle to seek relief. If Plaintiff seeks an order staying the entire case, it must file a proper motion seeking such relief. *See* Local Rule 7-2(a). The Court does not opine herein as to the merits of such a request.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 3, 2018

NANCY J. KOPPE

United States Magistrate Judge